

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated September 5, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present Application. Claims 1 and 2 are amended leaving Claims 1-4 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed. Particularly, the support for amended Claim 1 is at least found in originally filed Claim 2, Figure 1 and in the specification at page 3, lines 2-5 and page 5, lines 7-10.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Amtower, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,272,204 (hereinafter “Amtower”) in view of Zweig, U.S. Patent No. 5,590,170 (hereinafter “Zweig”).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Navab, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,198,404 (hereinafter “Navab”) in view of Zweig. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

“a camera that *simultaneously receives* an X-ray image amplified through the light amplifying unit and a visual image by the optical unit to obtain information, *wherein, on a light axis between the light generating unit and the camera, a half mirror is arranged with a predetermined angle, and wherein, on an emitting light axis of the optical unit, a reflection mirror is arranged in a position being on a same line in a horizontal direction where the half mirror is placed.*”

Firstly, Applicant respectfully submit that Amtower, Zweig and Navab, alone or in combination, *do not teach or suggest, a camera that **simultaneously receives** an X-ray image amplified through the light amplifying unit and a visual image by the optical unit to obtain information* of amended Claim 1.

Amtower uses a plurality of cameras to obtain X-ray and visual images. (See, for example, Abstract, Summary of the Invention, Figure 1 and Claim 1.) Zweig also uses a plurality of cameras to obtain X-ray and visual images. (See, for example, Col. 3, lines 50-60, Figure 1 and Claim 1.) Navab obtains a composite data set of the X-ray image and the visual image using mirrors, but separate detectors 542 and 570 are used to receive the visual (i.e., light) and X-ray portions, respectively. (See, for example, Col. 4, lines 22-38 and Figure 5.) Therefore, Amtower, Zweig and Navab, alone or in combination, *do not teach or suggest, a camera that **simultaneously receives** an X-ray image amplified through the light amplifying unit and a visual image by the optical unit to obtain information* of amended Claim 1.

Furthermore, since Amtower, Zweig and Navab teach only multiple, or separate cameras for the X-ray and visual images, respectively, instead of a camera that **simultaneously receives** X-ray and visual images, Applicants respectfully submit that Amtower, Zweig and Navab teach *contrary to the claimed invention*.

Secondly, in the Office action, it is alleged that Navab teaches on an *emitting light axis* of the detector of transmitted light 542, a mirror 524 is arranged in a position being on the same line in a horizontal direction where the transparent mirror 562 is placed. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As taught by Navab, the detector of transmitted light 542 *receives* light from the light source 510. (Col. 4, lines 22-31 and Figure 5.) That is, the *detector* of transmitted light 542 in no way *emits light*, but to the contrary, only receives or detects light. The detector of transmitted light 542 of Navab necessarily then, does not have an “emitting light axis” as claimed. Therefore, Navab does not teach or suggest wherein, on an emitting light axis of the optical unit, a reflection mirror is arranged in a position being on a same line in a horizontal direction where the half mirror is placed of amended Claim 1.

Finally, in addition to being evidenced by the rejection details of the Office action, Applicants respectfully submit that Amtower and Zweig do not teach or suggest the limitations including wherein, on a light axis between the light generating unit and the camera, a half mirror is arranged with a predetermined angle, and wherein, on an emitting light axis of the optical unit, a reflection mirror is arranged in a position being on a same line in a horizontal direction where the half mirror is placed of amended Claim 1, and taken from Claim 2. Therefore, Zweig does not remedy the deficiencies of Navab with respect to amended Claim 1.

Thus, since Amtower, Zweig and Navab, alone or in combination, *fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations* of amended Claim 1, and since Amtower, Zweig and Navab teach *contrary to the claimed invention*, for all the reasons discussed above, *prime facie* obviousness does not exist regarding amended Claim 1, with respect to Amtower, Zweig and Navab. Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not further rejected or objected, and is therefore allowable. As Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1, they are correspondingly allowable. Entry of the claim amendments, reconsideration, withdrawal of the relevant §103 rejections, and allowance of Claims 1-4 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

Applicants hereby petition for any necessary extension of time required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a) or 1.136(b) which may be required for entry and consideration of the present Reply.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /Amy Bizon-Copp/
Amy Bizon-Copp
Reg. No. 53,993
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: December 5, 2007